

a Paris interview, Lindbergh said, "I am an air mail pilot and expect to fly the mail again." And, as a matter of fact, he later did fly his old route between Chicago and St. Louis once again.

Although the Post Office Department actually carried mail up to August 1927, it gradually surrendered its operations as soon as contractors with the ability and sufficient financial backing to perform the service could be secured. The Department fostered and nurtured commercial aviation and then turned it over to private enterprise.

We have other examples of a similar pattern in Post Office history. In most industrialized foreign countries, telephone, telegraph, and broadcasting facilities are owned by the government. In the United States, we feel that these functions are best left in private hands. However, the telegraph began as a Government-fostered enterprise in this country.

A telegraph line was opened between Washington and Baltimore in 1845. It was built at Government expense by its inventor, Samuel F. B. Morse. Postmaster General Cave Johnson fixed the cost at 1 cent for every four characters.

When Morse offered his patent to the Government for \$100,000, the Post Office Department turned it down as unpromising. Postmaster General Johnson advised Morse "that

the operation of the telegraph between Washington and Baltimore had not satisfied him that under any rate of postage that could be adopted, its revenues could be made equal to its expenditures."

Postmaster General Johnson's crystal ball was a mite clouded, but so were the crystal balls of later seers. Here is a story that appeared in a Boston newspaper about three-quarters of a century ago:

"A man about 46 years of age, giving the name of Joshua Coppersmith, has been arrested in New York for attempting to extort funds from ignorant and superstitious people by exhibiting a device which he says will convey the human voice over metallic wires. He calls the instrument a 'telephone' which is obviously intended to imitate the word 'telegraph' and win the confidence of those who know the success of the latter instrument. Well-informed people know that it is impossible to transmit the human voice over wires as may be done with dots and dashes and signals of the Morse Code, and that, even were it possible to do so, the thing would be of no practical value. The authorities who apprehended this criminal are to be congratulated, and it is hoped that his punishment will be prompt and fitting, that it may serve as an example to other conscienceless schemers who enrich themselves at the expense of their fellow creatures."

The bad prophets have not been restricted to the field of communications. As late as 1901, Wilbur Wright doubted that man would fly "within a thousand years."

We need not feel superior to the bad guessers of times past. Wilbur Wright, despite his own skepticism, went on to fly the first heavier-than-air machine with his brother only 2 years later. We have a copious share of the timid and unimaginative amongst us today.

There are those who are against the attempt to fly a man to the moon because they say it would cost too much. There are those who oppose renewed efforts to reach a test-ban agreement on the grounds that we have failed before. There are those whose only answer 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation to the demands for equality and justice of Negro Americans is more patience and further delay. The following words were written by Abraham Lincoln in 1862:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. * * * As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

Today, we must, once again, disenthral ourselves.

I wish the Civil Aeronautics Board a happy birthday and continued success in guiding the aviation industry.

Happy landings to all of you.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 1, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOM,
July 1, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House
of Representatives.

The Reverend Michael J. Churak, supreme chaplain of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, offered the following prayer:

O Holy Lord, Father Almighty, eternal God, from Whom all authority proceeds, and under whose loving care nations prosper and flourish, deign to bless all assembled here for the opening of this session of the House of Representatives. Be present with us, O Holy Spirit, throughout this session. Come to help us in our affairs and deign to enter into our deliberations.

Direct us in our paths to seek the welfare of all our citizens, without regard to race, color, or creed, to assure the blessings of freedom for all peoples throughout the world even those who now suffer from tyranny and oppression. Let us strive to promote peace among all the nations of the world, a peace founded on the four pillars of "truth, justice, love, and freedom"—"Pacem in Terris," Pope John XXIII.

In this 11th centennial year of the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Slovakia and during the observance of SS. Cyril and Methodius Week—July 1 to

July 7—we especially invoke Thee to look down upon the 2 million citizens, Americans of Slovak descent, who, enriched with the heritage of these saintly brothers, have contributed to the material and spiritual well-being of America.

As we approach the celebration of the Declaration of Independence of our own country, look down, we humbly invoke Thee, on the nation of Slovakia and all nations, whose people have been deprived of the blessings of freedom. Grant, we pray, that truth, justice, love, and freedom may prevail in our own beloved country and among all the peoples of the world. This we ask in the name of Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 27, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1267. An act for the relief of Lawrence E. Bird;

H.R. 1275. An act for the relief of Miss Ann Super;

H.R. 1292. An act for the relief of Carmela Calabrese DiVito;

H.R. 1332. An act for the relief of Mario Rodrigues Fonseca;

H.R. 1736. An act for the relief of Assunta DiLella Codella;

H.R. 3356. An act for the relief of Josephine Maria (Bonaccorso) Bowtell;

H.R. 4773. An act for the relief of Leroy Smullenberger, a referee in bankruptcy.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which

the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 280. An act for the relief of Etsuko Matsuo McClellan;

S. 296. An act for the relief of Anne Marie Kee Tham;

S. 538. An act for the relief of Henry Bang Williams;

S. 546. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for the use of lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, Calif., for a nuclear electric generating station;

S. 568. An act for the relief of Denis Ryan;

S. 733. An act for the relief of Yung Yuen Yau;

S. 753. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giuseppe Rafala Monarca;

S. 879. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the building of Perry's fleet and the Battle of Lake Erie;

S. 1082. An act to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1125. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood;

S. 1201. An act for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux;

S. 1230. An act for the relief of Carlton M. Richardson;

S. 1401. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, construct, operate, and regulate a public off-street parking facility;

S. 1489. An act for the relief of J. Arthur Fields; and

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired.

AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker on Thursday, June 27, 1963, the Speaker did

on June 28, 1963, sign the following enrolled bill of the Senate:

S. 1359. An act to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary in the Treasury Department.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5207

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 5207, the Foreign Service Buildings Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS AND THE BUDGET

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is a significant day on the congressional calendar and at the Treasury. Today, July 1, is the first day of the new fiscal year 1964. Throughout the country businessmen generally are accustomed, at the end of the old fiscal year and the beginning of the new fiscal year, to strike a balance to ascertain just where they stand financially. It is perhaps not amiss for us to briefly record just where we are in the appropriations business of the session and the condition of the budget.

APPROPRIATION ACTIONS TO DATE

Seven appropriation bills for fiscal 1964 and two bills for fiscal 1963, disposing of about \$73,631,000,000 of the President's current budget requests, have been sent to the Senate. The Committee on Appropriations cut the budget in these bills by \$3,833,000,000. The House did not agree in some particulars and restored \$432,000,000. Thus the nine bills were sent to the other body \$3,401,000,000 below the corresponding budget requests.

In addition to the two bills for fiscal 1963, the Senate has also passed upon three of the regular 1964 bills, involving budget requests, in all, of \$9,518,000,000. And, characteristically, four of the five bills were returned carrying larger appropriations than originally voted by the House—\$207,000,000 more.

Three bills—the two for fiscal 1963 and one for fiscal 1964—have been enacted into law. In total, they were \$286,000,000 below the budget amounts.

APPROPRIATION BILLS NOT YET REPORTED

Five regular 1964 bills, plus the usual closing supplemental, remain to be reported to the House. They prospectively involve requests of roughly \$26,000,000,000 on the present basis. One of these, the District appropriation bill, will be taken up on the floor next week. Hearings on the others are either completed or well along. All of them hinge, in whole or in part, on annual authori-

zation bills not yet enacted—in two instances, not even reported from the legislative committees. The Committee on Appropriations cannot, under the rules of the House, bring in a bill until the appropriation has been authorized by law.

In the meantime the Government is operating on a minimum basis under the general continuing resolution.

BACKDOOR APPROPRIATIONS

In addition, the significant backdoor bill thus far is the \$2,000,000,000 for the Export-Import Bank which the House refused to approve on the backdoor basis but on which the Senate insists. The Senate has never been reluctant to initiate backdoor appropriations—and they are trying it on this bill, and unfortunately for the prerogatives and position of the House maintained from the beginning, there is a not inconsiderable encouragement on occasion from the legislative committees. It is incredible that Members would in any way encourage and support erosion of this all-important position of the House as the body closest to the people and to their pocketbooks.

FISCAL SITUATION

Mr. Speaker, we are spending money at a more rapid rate than ever before. The interest on the public debt—over \$10,000,000,000 a year—is appalling. There seems to be no serious thought about liquidating the debt on a systematic basis or of decreasing our rate of spending. Our expenditures are constantly accelerating. We are taking in more money, we are enjoying more national revenue than ever before in the history of the country but we are still running in the red. The fiscal year 1963 closed yesterday with a deficit somewhere near \$8,000,000,000. In the year beginning today we face another big deficit—no one knows just how much. And for the 10th consecutive year—a full decade—we have disregarded precedent and again extended war taxes in time of peace, and still the budget is out of balance. Still the Treasury has to go out and borrow from future generations to meet the higher and higher expenditures. It is becoming almost characteristic that the more money the Treasury takes in the more it spends.

Slowly but surely circumstances are in the process of conveying at the point representing the inevitable limit. We owe more—our national debt limit this morning, under the terms of the recent extension, is \$309,000,000,000—the highest in 175 years. And that is only for the next 60 days. Continuing to insist on spending more than the Treasury collects makes it necessary to boost the ceiling next month closer to the inevitable limit—to the suggested figure of at least \$320,000,000,000. And further deficits have been flatly predicted for 2 more years. That means another debt boost—27 deficits in the last 33 years—with at least 3 more to follow before any hope of the budget being in the black. Incredible.

Mr. Speaker, the prewar purchasing power of the dollar is now down to 45 cents. In 1936 it was \$1.07. The decline is in no small measure due to these constant expenditures in excess of the reve-

nue—inflation. As a result, the cost of living has gone up. Every family today is spending over twice what they formerly spent to maintain themselves at the existing cost of living. In the last 2 months the official index hit a new high—and the dollar a new low.

The Treasury's supply of gold is now down to \$15,700,000,000. We have lost \$7,200,000,000 of it since the run began in early 1958. With the persistent imbalance, the persistent deficit in our balance of international transactions, it is of little or no comfort that the precipitate gold outflow has subsided. The supply remains low, and is getting lower. We lost \$65,000,000 more last week. The situation is precarious. And the way we manhandle the value of our dollar it seems highly unlikely foreign bankers holding claims on our gold will materially upgrade their confidence in it. Spending money we do not have for things we could postpone until we had the money has contributed heavily to the deterioration. Nondefense spending has unbalanced the budgets time and again, as we have repeatedly documented. And continuing to spend more than we take in, loading the difference on future generations, will certainly make foreign holders of our dollars more apprehensive—and skeptical—about our willingness to face up to the demand of the times. As a high administration official said not so long ago, foreign holders of dollars would much prefer that we put a ceiling on Federal spending than on the Federal debt.

It is to be hoped, it is to be urged, Mr. Speaker, that we take under serious consideration a policy which will significantly reduce the expansion of present programs and eliminate new programs which require further expenditures and simultaneously place into effect a program which will reduce the burdensome Federal taxes.

We do not have to go very far to find out who is responsible for ever-increasing spending beyond what we take in. In the final analysis, Congress is responsible—often, of course, as the urgent request of the executive branch. Hardly a month passes but what we are authorizing some new projects, some new program, some new activity that has never been provided before. We are almost constantly authorizing and appropriating for some new expenditures, for new activities, or expanding going programs when we cannot pay or refuse to pay for the old ones which we have authorized and appropriated over the years. Every budget from the executive branch advocates new activities and new spending.

But the final responsibility is right here in Congress. We have to quit authorizing new projects and expanding old programs and begin paying for the old projects for which we owe. I trust this will be taken into consideration in the near future, and that there will be serious effort to pay something on our indebtedness in order to help our credit.

I include as a part of my remarks a table showing the various appropriation bills of the session to date. We are cutting the budget but at the same time appropriating larger amounts than the previous year.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of July 1, 1963

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Bill No.	Title	House							
		Budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with—	
								Budget estimates	Amount reported
1963 SUPPLEMENTALS									
H.J. Res. 284.....	Supplemental, Agriculture.....	1 \$508,172,000	Feb. 26	\$508,172,000		Feb. 27	\$508,172,000		
H.R. 5517.....	Supplemental.....	1,641,507,106	Apr. 5	988,756,506	—\$652,750,600	Apr. 10	1,438,691,506	—\$202,815,600	+\$449,935,000
	Public works acceleration.....	(500,000,000)		(.....)	(—500,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(—50,000,000)	(+450,000,000)
	All other.....	(1,141,507,106)		(988,756,506)	(—152,750,600)		(988,691,506)	(—152,815,600)	(—65,000)
	Total, 1963 supplementals.....	2,149,679,106		1,496,928,506	—652,750,600		1,946,863,506	—202,815,600	+449,935,000
1964 APPROPRIATIONS									
H.R. 5279.....	Interior.....	998,009,000	Mar. 28	929,690,200	—68,318,800	Apr. 2	922,625,200	—75,383,800	—7,065,000
	Loan authorization.....	(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(—7,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(—7,000,000)	
	Contract authority.....	(17,500,000)		(.....)	(—17,500,000)		(.....)	(—17,500,000)	
H.R. 5366.....	Treasury-Post Office.....	6,146,842,000	Apr. 1	5,997,026,000	—149,816,000	Apr. 4	5,997,026,000	—149,816,000	
H.R. 5888.....	Labor-HEW.....	5,759,480,000	Apr. 25	5,449,988,000	—309,501,000	Apr. 30	5,449,981,000	—309,508,000	—7,000
H.R. 6754.....	Agriculture.....	6,368,755,000	June 3	5,979,457,000	—389,298,000	June 6	5,979,457,000	—389,298,000	
	Loan authorizations.....	(855,000,000)		(855,000,000)			(855,000,000)		
H.R. 6868.....	Legislative.....	148,580,245	June 6	140,038,919	—8,541,326	June 11	140,038,919	—8,541,326	
H.R. 7063.....	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary.....	2,159,891,900	June 14	1,851,269,900	—308,622,000	June 18	1,851,269,900	—308,622,000	
H.R. 7179.....	Defense.....	49,014,237,000	June 21	47,092,209,000	—1,922,028,000		47,082,009,000	—1,932,228,000	—10,200,000
	Total, 1964 appropriations.....	70,595,804,145		67,439,679,019	—3,156,125,126		67,422,407,019	—3,173,397,126	—17,272,000
	Total, all appropriations.....	72,745,483,251		68,936,607,525	—3,808,875,726		69,369,270,525	—3,376,212,726	+432,663,000
	Total, loan authorizations.....	(868,000,000)		(861,000,000)	(—7,000,000)		(861,000,000)	(—7,000,000)	
	Total, contract authority.....	(17,500,000)		(.....)	(—17,500,000)		(.....)	(—17,500,000)	

Bill No.	Title	Senate							Final action			Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date
		Budget estimates to Senate	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—		Date approved	Amount as approved	Public Law No.	
							Budget estimates	House action				
1963 SUPPLEMENTALS												
H.J. Res. 284.....	Supplemental, Agriculture.....	\$508,172,000	Feb. 28	\$508,172,000	Mar. 4	\$508,172,000	-----	-----	Mar. 6	\$508,172,000	88-1	-----
H.R. 5517.....	Supplemental.....	1,652,300,456	Apr. 24	1,486,096,841	May 1	1,488,683,841	-\$163,616,615	+\$49,992,335	May 17	1,467,430,491	88-25	-\$184,869,965
	Public works acceleration.....	(500,000,000)		(450,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(-50,000,000)			(450,000,000)		(-50,000,000)
	All other.....	(1,152,300,456)		(1,036,096,841)		(1,038,683,841)	(-113,616,615)	(+49,992,335)		(1,017,430,491)		(-134,869,965)
	Total, 1963 supplementals.....	2,160,472,456		1,994,268,841		1,996,855,841	-163,616,615	+49,992,335		1,975,602,491		-184,869,965
1964 APPROPRIATIONS												
H.R. 5279.....	Interior.....	998,009,000	May 22	979,093,400	May 28	979,693,400	-18,315,600	+57,068,200				
	Loan authorization.....	(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(-7,000,000)					
	Contract authority.....	(17,500,000)					(-17,500,000)					
H.R. 5366.....	Treasury-Post Office.....	6,146,842,000	May 3	6,074,216,250	May 8	6,069,466,250	-77,375,750	+72,440,250	June 13	6,045,466,000	88-39	-101,376,000
H.R. 5888.....	Labor-HEW.....											
H.R. 6754.....	Agriculture.....											
	Loan authorizations.....											
H.R. 6868.....	Legislative.....	182,218,450	June 25	168,273,069	June 26	168,273,069	-13,945,381	+28,234,150				
H.R. 7063.....	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary.....											
H.R. 7179.....	Defense.....											
	Total, 1964 appropriations.....	7,327,069,450		7,221,582,719		7,217,432,719	-109,636,731	+157,742,600		6,045,466,000		-101,376,000
	Total, all appropriations.....	9,487,541,906		9,215,851,560		9,214,288,560	-273,253,346	+207,734,935		8,021,068,491		-286,245,965
	Total, loan authorizations.....	(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(-7,000,000)					
	Total, contract authority.....	(17,500,000)					(-17,500,000)					

¹ Shifted from budget for 1964, which was reduced accordingly.

² Excludes Senate items.

NOTE.—Totals reflect amounts approved and comparisons at latest stage of congressional action on each bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am always glad to hear our chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, talk about the road on which we are traveling at breakneck speed, the road to national bankruptcy.

I, too, have admonished the Congress of the United States on many occasions to make an about face before it is too late.

Now, to give you a few figures which will put this matter in focus a little better. I am sure that not too many people realize that each American family today must pay about \$15 a month just to pay the interest on the national debt. They must also pay about \$25 a month just to pay the salaries of Federal employees. We passed a bill a few days ago, a military appropriation bill, which called for each American family to pay \$75 a month. There in those three items alone the American family, each American family, on an average will pay in the fiscal year 1964, \$115 every month. That brings it down to facts and figures that most people can understand. That is to say, this brings it down to facts and figures on what the people have to pay above the many Federal expenditures that we are called on to appropriate for each year.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we approach July 4, 1963, the 187th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence in Philadelphia—a dedicatory first act of a new nation which had set as its goal the exemplification of the innate dignity and freedom of man and his inherent right of liberty of movement, speech, press and religion.

In 1776 our forefathers brought into being a nation founded on the principle that man is endowed by his Creator with inalienable rights, among which is a government of the people, by and with the consent of the people, for the benefit of all the people. This was a new concept of political independence replacing the centuries-old tradition of privileges reserved to a minority of citizens specially endowed by birth, education, religion, or race.

Of all our national holidays, July Fourth is enshrined as a hallowed memory and living reminder of the birth of a great democratic idea which has continued to grow and expand, to bless not only the United States of America but all mankind.

It is fitting that each year we should pause, reflect, and pay homage to our Founding Fathers whose wisdom brought this great Nation into being, and rededicate ourselves to the principles which they espoused and bequeathed to us in perpetuity.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the reverence and patriotic fervor basic to commemoration of this historic day can best be expressed by a national ringing of bells throughout the land.

I am joined in my belief by members of the Civitan Club of Homestead, the Delta Mu Chapter, Beta Sigma Phi, Homestead, and various other civic organizations in the Fourth District of Florida, of which I have the privilege and honor to be the Representative. By resolution, the Civitan Club of Homestead, said:

The Civitan Club of Homestead resolves that it heartily favors the joint resolutions of Senator RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, and Representative Walter, of Pennsylvania, providing for observance of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence each year by the ringing of bells throughout the United States and urges the Florida delegations in the Senate and House to support such resolution. It also urges the Florida Legislature to adopt a similar resolution for a State observance of such anniversary.

In support of my belief, I am introducing today a House concurrent resolution requesting Congress to declare that the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence should be observed each year by the ringing of bells throughout the United States at the hour of 2 o'clock in the afternoon, eastern daylight time, on July 4, and for a formal call upon civic and other community leaders to follow congressional leadership and to take appropriate steps to encourage public participation in such observance.

Never in our long history, Mr. Speaker, have we had greater reason nor a better occasion for establishing a national annual tradition to express our recognition of and respect for the courage and foresight of our Founding Fathers and the greatness of our people and our Nation.

NIGERIA AND ALGERIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee, I have two happy announcements to make to the House. One relates to Algeria and the other to Nigeria.

The Republic of Algeria achieved its independence in July, 1 year ago. The Algerian nation has labored during its first year of independence successfully toward overcoming the grave problems of establishing a new nation. Americans admire the Algerian people for their drive to shape their own destinies and strengthen their national independence. It is heartening and reassuring that Algeria's relations with other nations have, in this first year of independence,

achieved in recent days both a major agreement with the Government of France and the signature of an agreement with the United States which will assist in the rehabilitation of rural areas of Algeria.

We, who celebrate our independence from colonial rule on July 4, send our best wishes for the future of this vital young republic which celebrates its independence just 1 day later on July 5. We look forward to years of fruitful cooperation, based on the devotion of both our nations to the principles of the United Nations Charter. We note with pleasure and pride that the day the Algerians have selected as their day of rejoicing for their independence is so close to the day on which we in the United States celebrate our independence.

Mr. Speaker, this week we are honored by a visit to our country of the Honorable E. P. Okoya, the distinguished Minister of Information of Eastern Nigeria. We are honored by his presence here and my own city of Chicago is eagerly looking forward to his visit there before he returns to his own country. For the House and especially for the Subcommittee on Africa, I extend warm greetings.

This week we celebrate our liberation from colonialism. In 180 years that have passed since the attainment of our national sovereignty the United States has become the first nation of the free world in power, in wealth, and in influence. It is natural, Mr. Speaker, that we should feel a deep and abiding interest in the new African nations. Theirs is the challenge that was ours when as a new sovereign nation we had to make our own way. As our United States met the challenge, so in equal measure, with equal effort and dedication we have the faith that new independent nations of Africa will meet their challenge. Every step in their progress will occasion rejoicing in every American heart. We, the first to break from colonialism, have so very, very much in common with these nations, the last to break from colonialism.

SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS, ROMAN EMPEROR

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week, a colleague from the State of Illinois inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an attack upon Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, the senior Senator from my State of Louisiana. He attempted to castigate the good Senator because of his statement that Africans have never shown any ability to build or to govern. He supported his amusing "refutation" by pointing with great pride to the record of the Roman Emperor, Septimius Severus, who reigned from A.D. 193 to A.D. 211 and, who, according to our colleague, was a Negro.

There is one authoritative biographer of Septimius, Maurice Platmauer, whose "The Life and Reign of the Emperor Lucius Septimius Severus" was the first detailed account published in the English language. It is 221 exhausting pages in length, yet makes no mention of the Negroid ancestry of Septimius. Neither does "Methuen's History of the Greek and Roman World" mention what would have been an extreme curiosity had Septimius been a Negro. And, finally, Edward Gibbon, in his monumental "History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" does not give any hint that Septimius was a Negro.

Since these three world-renowned authorities do not make mention that Septimius was a Negro, I think it is safe to assume that he was not. Such an oddity would hardly have been overlooked by these meticulous historians.

Such an omission would be comparable to a modern historian failing to note that George Washington was a woman, had he been one, or that Fidel Castro was, in reality, Carmen Miranda with a beard.

Be all this as it may, let us for a moment, but only for the sake of discussion, say this noble Roman was a Negro.

Before my colleague's admiration swells out of all bounds, one or two facts should be brought to his attention.

Septimius was a follower and imitator of his predecessor, the Emperor Hadrian, whose political philosophy was built on supreme control by the Emperor of all the internal organization of the Empire. Methuen's "History of the Greek and Roman World" says that: "toward the senate he adopted an attitude of deferential respect, but at the same time, by encroaching upon its spheres of administration, treated it as a negligible factor in the Government."

If all this sounds familiar to my colleague from Illinois, it may be because Hadrian's theory of government has more than a passing resemblance to the philosophy of a more recent administration.

History indicates that Septimius plotted the assassination of his predecessor. It states without equivocation, that he seized power at the head of an army, bought off the opposition with lavish payments and can be credited with the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of his contemporaries.

I feel it is necessary, too, that I remind my colleague, who has such a reverence for Septimius, that one of the notable occurrences during his reign was his calling to trial 64 members of the Roman Senate and summarily executing 29 of them and confiscating their property. Again, Methuen's History says:

The motive for this cruelty is hard to discover and would seem to spring from nothing else than a determination to abase the senate, which for 3 years he had found it politic to conciliate, but now was strong enough to despise and treat as an instrument of his autocracy.

This suggests to me that my colleague might well keep his eye open for a modern day Septimius, should there be one. The fact that my colleague is a member of the House rather than the

Senate may not be enough to save him if he should lose favor if there is a Septimius the Second anywhere in the wings.

If he needs an example of the ability of the Negro to build a civilization and guide his own destiny without the help of the white race, he need look no further than the island of Hispaniola and the 1963 Government of Haiti or recall the stories which made the rounds recently about one of the delegates from an emerging nation who was, a few years ago, cubed and eaten by his followers in the belief that they would, in so doing, attain a portion of his superior intelligence. He might recall, also, another story told in the halls of the United Nations of another emerging delegate who solved the perennial mother-in-law problem by eating his.

However weak the individual white man, his ancestors produced the greatness of Europe and America; however strong the individual black, his ancestors never lifted themselves from the darkness of Africa.

One final observation on the reign of that noble and illustrious Roman and alleged Negro, Septimius Severus. His reign began in 193 A.D. The world authority, Edward Gibbon, dates the beginning of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire from almost that precise moment in its glorious history.

APPORTIONMENT OF DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7307 amends the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954 with respect to the apportionment of the depletion allowance between parties to contracts for the extraction of minerals or the severance of timber.

The Internal Revenue Code now provides—section 611(b)(1)—and has provided for about 40 years:

In the case of a lease, the deduction (for depletion) shall be equitably apportioned between the lessor and lessee.

The courts have engrafted onto this provision a concept called economic interest, under which they have allowed various other parties to claim some of the depletion allowance. In 1959, the Supreme Court sharply limited the economic interest concept, and denied any depletion allowance to contractors who extracted coal from the lands of others, without having acquired any interest in the coal in place by purchase or lease from the landowners or their lessees.

In the 1959 case, *Parsons v. Smith*, 359 U.S. 215, the Supreme Court reviewed the history of the depletion deduction and said:

In short, the purpose of the depletion deduction is to permit the owner of a capital interest in mineral in place to make a

tax-free recovery of that depleting capital asset.

Since 1959, the lower courts have followed the Supreme Court with nearly complete uniformity, and have held that contractors extracting coal or other minerals from lands or leaseholds owned by another party are not entitled to any depletion deduction. This is the rule originally intended by Congress when the equitable apportionment provision—quoted above—was enacted. Such intention has been reiterated by the action of Congress with respect to depletion allowances—particularly depletion for coal—on several recent occasions. In none of these revisions—the definition of property in section 614 in 1954 and 1958, and the treatment of coal royalties as capital gains in section 631 in 1951 and 1954—has Congress given the slightest indication that so-called contractors are entitled to a depletion allowance.

To give persons extracting minerals under contract with the owners thereof an allowance for depletion is as incongruous as it would be to give the firm under contract to wash the windows of an office building an allowance for depreciation on the building.

The Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, however, has recently fallen into this error, in *Elm Development Company* against Commissioner—March 19, 1963—in spite of guidance from the Supreme Court in the case of *Parsons* against *Smith*, 1959.

Reversing the Tax Court, and reaching a result contrary to that of a large number of cases decided in that court and in the Courts of Appeals for the Third and Fifth Circuits, the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit allowed a coal contractor to deduct depletion. This case is especially incomprehensible because the contract was terminable not only upon default of the contractor, but also in the event that the contract turned out to be unprofitable to the leasehold owner.

The confusion caused by the *Elm Development Co.* case will undoubtedly lead to renewed harassment by the Internal Revenue Service of landowners and lessees who are rightfully entitled to the depletion allowance. To the extent that the contractors may be successful in persuading the Service or the courts that their claims are valid, the Service of course may be expected to press for disallowance of depletion deductions claimed by the true owners of the mineral in place. The latter are the persons to whom Congress intended to allow depletion, in recognition of the fact that their capital was being diminished by the extraction of the mineral.

H.R. 7307 is a clarifying amendment, which will settle once and for all the question of apportionment of depletion allowances. It provides that no part of the depletion deduction shall be apportioned to a contracting party who, first, is neither an owner nor a lessee of the property; second, is required by the contract to deliver all units extracted or severed to another contracting party; and third, is paid under the contract a

fixed sum for each unit so delivered—the tonnage rate used in computing which sum may vary according to market conditions—payment of which sum is a personal covenant of such other contracting party, enforceable without regard to the amount realized by such other contracting party from the disposition of such units.

EXCESSIVE FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything this morning but I was intrigued by the statement of the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations and also by the ranking minority member of that committee. I would like to believe that it is twinges of conscience that bring about these speeches. Apparently they make the speeches and I cast the vote. But let me assure my colleagues of the House that this question of continuing to vote more money than we have the ability to raise is creating serious damage to this country and is going to put us in a position where, I regret to say, we will be a second-rate power in the world.

GETTYSBURG ADDRESS COMMEMORATIVE COIN

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the 100th anniversary of the first day of the Battle of Gettysburg, I today introduced a bill to have the U.S. mint commemorative coins to honor the century anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. I have the honor to represent Lincoln's hometown, Springfield, Ill., and much of the district which Lincoln once represented in Congress.

The United States should have a suitable commemorative honor for the century observance of the immortal Gettysburg Address on November 19 of this year. The striking of a commemorative coin is a traditional means of marking an important national occasion. In honor of the address a commemorative coin was issued in 1938 on the 75th anniversary.

My bill would authorize the coining of 250,000 50-cent pieces whose design would be decided by the Director of the Mint and the Secretary of the Treasury. They would bear the date of the year in which they were minted and would be issued on special request.

With all its tragic bloodshed, misery, and destruction, the Battle of Gettysburg was the climax of the war which pitted American brother against American

brother. As the battle represents the peak of bitterness in American history, so Lincoln's simple speech dedicating the resting place of the fallen represents the peak in eloquent compassion of an American statesman for his fellow Americans.

WORST COST-PRICE SQUEEZE IN 24 YEARS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the farm parity ratio information just released by the Department of Agriculture shows the lowest 6-month average since 1939.

The 6-month average is 77½. Parity ratio for June 15 just released over the weekend was 77, the same as May and March. In April it was 78. When President Kennedy took office it was 80.

Parity ratio shows the relationship between prices paid by farmers and prices received by farmers. It is far more significant than the level of commodity prices. Farmers are clearly in the worst cost-price squeeze in 24 years.

UNITED STATES SHOULD OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's foreign policy, announced recently by President Kennedy in a speech to American University, calls for reexamination of United States-Soviet relations.

This program, looking toward friendly coexistence with communism, would seem to explain the administration's quiet repudiation of the onetime official week set aside each year by Presidential proclamation of Captive Nations Week. In this connection, the propaganda campaign being waged by the Department of State to cleanse the bloody countenance of Janos Kadar and somehow make light of his treachery, which resulted in the torture and murder of so many Hungarians, indicates that the administration has apparently abandoned the historic American dedication to universal freedom.

There are 17 million Americans who were born behind the Iron Curtain, plus many additional first generation Americans from Eastern Europe, who are known to be anti-Communist. Scores of ethnic newspapers, in addition to the activities of their countless clubs and organizations, are proof positive of this statement.

Yet, this sentiment has been largely ignored by the Federal Government. We are now approaching the fourth anniversary of Captive Nations Week, set for July 16 to July 23. Last year, the White House waited until practically the last minute before issuing the Cap-

tive Nations Proclamation, as authorized by unanimous joint resolution of the Congress. Again this year, the White House is letting the weeks slip by in silence.

On the other hand, it is interesting to observe that the White House announced a United Nations Week months ahead, officially sanctioning the extensive preparations involved in its observance. The difference is obvious—the United Nations Week does not offend the Kremlin; Captive Nations Week does. The question arises, what is the idea behind Captive Nations Week which so infuriates Nikita Khrushchev and his Communist henchmen, and which our State Department apparently also bitterly resists? The answer in a nutshell is that Captive Nations Week is a constant, goading reminder that communism must take by force what it wants—that men want to be free—that communism is doomed to eventual failure, because of the constant erosion by the minds and wills of freemen against the dullness and drab enslavement of its victims. Consequently, the Kremlin gang at least once each year is jarred by the ugly fact which Captive Nations Week holds high before the world—bloody force, not choice, is the implement of Communist expansion.

Now, the appeasers are at work. Their foolish philosophy has been proven false and dangerous throughout history. Theirs is a simple plan—do not do anything that irks Khrushchev, he may turn out to be a good guy, after all. What obvious folly. Only fuzzy-headed New Frontier State Department advisers could have such childish faith in this Pollyanna philosophy. The State Department takes the position that we must not provoke the Kremlin by offering a ray of hope to its slaves. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said, with reference to legislation establishing a Captive Nations Committee “the establishment of such a committee at this time would likely be a source of contention” to the Soviet Union. Mr. Rusk also stated:

The U.S. Government's position is weakened by any action which confuses the rights of formerly independent peoples or nations with the status of areas, such as Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia, which are traditional parts of the Soviet Union.

Last year, Captive Nations Week was downgraded by the administration, to the extent it was almost completely ineffective. This was especially true because the President's proclamation was withheld until the last minute and then was announced with only a minimum of fanfare. Its impact was almost in reverse. It was issued only as a politically motivated sop to the millions of people in the United States of Eastern European extraction, who should be justly angered at the pending sellout of Hungary. It appears they will get another just slap in the face this year, when Captive Nations Week is either abandoned, or is buried in marshmallow phrases, vague references to freedom, and careful avoidance of any mention whatsoever of nations held captive by international communism.

Former President Dwight Eisenhower started Captive Nations Week in 1959. In his first proclamation, Eisenhower said:

Many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism.

He said that:

Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and individual liberties.

He made no bones about who was responsible for the enslavement of many small nations. He branded the Russians as slave masters.

Last year's Captive Nations declaration was doctored by the State Department. All references to communism were deleted. It mumbled about "just aspirations of all people for national independence and freedom"—a wishy-washy heap of generalities so typical of the butter-pat softies at the State Department today.

As previously pointed out, the administration has strongly opposed the setting up of a Captive Nations Committee in the Congress. Again, fear of upsetting Khrushchev, and perhaps stirring up a torrid call over the hot line appears to be the motivation for this kind of re-examination of our relationship with Russia.

What is to be gained by placating the neighborhood bully? Only fools would fail to understand that appeasement, even when it is euphemistically called accommodation, invites more aggression. Retreat invites accelerated advances by communism. Exhibition of the fear of confrontation, of truth as it exists, invites duplicity and firming up of Communist rule.

Soviet Russia has one great fear—truth. The Kennedy administration is accommodating the Soviets by suppressing the truth about captive nations. Docile in the meadow, the lambs of the State Department hope to evade the attention of the voracious wolves of the Kremlin.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Americans to observe Captive Nations Week this year with more gusto than ever, and restore to it its true meaning, as once expressed by ex-President Eisenhower. I urge that we refuse to allow it to be squelched by the pallid utterances and perfunctory pronouncements of an administration acting under the misguided advice of State Department appeasers.

Stephen Vincent Benet expressed the true concept of the brotherhood of man which our sympathy characterizes for those who seek and want freedom. He said:

Grant us brotherhood, not only for this day but for all our years—a brotherhood not of words but of acts and deeds. We are all of us children of earth—grant us that simple knowledge. If our brothers are oppressed, then we are oppressed. If they hunger, we hunger. If their freedom is taken away, our freedom is not secure.

That should be the grim reminder to all Americans, that regardless of the sophistry of the New Frontier, as long as there are captive nations, we in America ourselves are in danger of becoming captives.

We, whose heritage is the glorious story of men who fought with raw courage for freedom, owe to those under the heel of totalitarianism the moral support which recognition of their plight and dissemination of the story to the rest of the world will bring.

As the time for Captive Nations Week draws near, it will be up to those who cherish American ideals and principles to plan observances, to extend every effort to publicize here and abroad the theme of this week—to tell the world that the light of freedom still burns, that Americans believe there is still hope. Leadership in our Nation fails, but the people themselves must act.

It is regrettable and humiliating that this must be done despite the openly admitted opposition of our own Government. But the once-free people of the captive nations will understand, as we the people of the United States ourselves understand their plight.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield.

Mr. STINSON. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Washington State. I think his speech very ably points up the complete lack of willingness on the part of the administration to attempt to thwart communism and to recognize the enslaved people of the eastern European area. No initiative to fully demonstrate America's indignation is to be found in today's administration—only an apparent willingness to make further accommodations to the Soviet Union. We should not forget that the Soviet Union is striving to have the United States included in its list of captive nations. It is indeed difficult to believe that just 4 short years ago, when our President was a Member of the Senate, Congress unanimously endorsed the idea of observing Captive Nations Week. I wish to thank my colleague for making this wonderful statement.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the State of Washington and for his remarks.

HOW TO MOBILIZE FORCES TO ERADICATE HUNGER FROM THE WORLD

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, at the vast World Food Congress, scores of speakers have addressed the assembly. The problem on which they spoke to the hundred-plus national delegations was one: Eradication of hunger from the world.

The capabilities and technical competences necessary to achieve this aim clearly exist. The question is: How to mobilize these forces to do the job.

Many speakers at the Congress stressed more use of international pub-

lic agencies. Many stressed government-to-government programs. Far fewer discussed the vast role which private enterprise can play in uplifting world nutritional levels.

In the latter connections, our colleagues may be particularly interested in the statesmanlike proposals from the private industry sector as made by Mr. Paul May, a Swiss, who is chairman of Knorr Food Products Co.

Knorr Soups, as I pointed out to this body last year, represent a more or less unique phenomenon these days: Technical assistance in reverse. These dehydrated soups, a new product in our markets, were developed in Europe. They are now being manufactured at Argo, Ill. These new products have created many hundreds of new American jobs directly in manufacturing—plus many hundreds more in warehousing, distribution, sales, and the like.

But, and also important to our free competitive system, the other American soup companies have now started to come out with their own brands of new dehydrated soups—thus creating numerous new jobs all across the United States. This is the American way.

It is for these reasons that I believe all Members of this body will wish to study the following summary of the thoughtful remarks of Mr. May:

FAO URGED TO FACILITATE PRIVATE FOOD INDUSTRY'S COOPERATION IN WORLD WAR ON HUNGER—INDUSTRY LIAISON COMMITTEE AND 1965 WORLD FOOD YEAR PROPOSED

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 7, 1963.—A call to developing nations to create climates of freedom with order in which the business know-how of the private food industry can work fully and effectively was voiced here today before the World Food Congress. Paul May, veteran Swiss food company executive, cited this as essential to solving the hunger problem in these nations and accelerating their economic growth.

To focus worldwide effort and attention toward these ends, Mr. May submitted three recommendations to the Congress:

1. Creation by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations of an international liaison committee with the private sector of the food industry to harness the resources of the food industry in all countries to human needs for food within specific nations;

2. United Nations designation of 1965 as World Food Year; and

3. Appointment by FAO of a recognized leader of the private sector of the international food industry to assist FAO in bringing together the food productive resources of the world to fight hunger.

Assuring the Congress of private industry's willingness to cooperate, the chairman of Knorr Food Products Co., an affiliate of Corn Products Co., told his international audience: "The food industry wants to work in the developing countries, if they will welcome it. The industry wants to be associated with the business people in these areas in the operation of modern food product enterprises."

He cited the food industry's "active participation in such enterprises" as "the only way" in which indispensable skills in such fields as market analysis, new product development, storage, packaging, and distribution can be put to work on the problem.

In an elaboration of the essential receptive climate which he labeled "freedom with order," Mr. May explained that "it is a system in which ideologies or dogmatic convictions about the manner in which things

must be done are submerged in the tangible processes of getting things done.

"The private sector does not demand monopoly, special privilege or freedom from competition, the food company executive continued, but rather is prepared to compete with each other to the benefit of the world's undernourished peoples.

"What the private sector cannot compete against," he asserted, "are governments unwilling to provide freedom with order. It does not look for favors when going into business in a new country. But it does expect a trustful attitude on the part of the various departments concerned—agriculture, finance, labor, production, education. Naturally, whether or not it continues to merit this trust depends on performance.

"And I admit that there is sometimes a suspicion of the motives of foreign industries seeking to go into business in these nations. But has not the time come to put aside these suspicions?

"What we bring," Mr. May declared, "is not a new colonialism. It is an offer to developing nations everywhere to enter frankly and fully into a world of international economic development, a world in which they themselves will be full partners."

Similar proposals for an FAO-industry liaison committee and a world food year were made last September before the Fifth International Food Congress in New York City by William T. Brady, chairman of Corn Products Co., and Dr. B. R. Sen, Director General of FAO.

Unless the private sector of the world economy is brought into the fight against hunger—and under fair and equitable terms of trade, as Mr. May suggests, this problem of world hunger may never be solved.

COOPERATIVE COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION COULD AID SENECA INDIANS

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill providing payment to the Seneca Nation of Indians of direct and indirect damages for the taking of their lands in the building of the Kinzua Dam. The bill provides for relocation, housing, education, special scholarships, and a tentative plan for recreation and tourist development.

Maximum development of the potential of this project, for the benefit of the Senecas and the area, absolutely requires the full cooperation and understanding of all parties. Accordingly, it is my recommendation that cooperative council be formed immediately with equal representation for the Senecas and Cattaraugus County. Such a council should meet regularly in a constructive, friendly, and informative manner, thus providing an ideal vehicle for dissipating suspicions on both sides.

Both the Senecas and the county have a vital stake in this development. We must avoid unnecessary frictions and animosities. It is my conviction that many of the differences of the past few months arose primarily from a lack of

effective communication between men of stature on both sides.

The accumulated evidence thus far, from studies by Federal agencies and private concerns hired by the Federal Government, indicates that the perfidy of Uncle Sam will cost him plenty in this case. Those of us who opposed the project warned that estimated Kinzua costs ignored the necessity of special damages to the Indians. Those special damages must be paid.

The bill I have introduced authorizes a total of \$13,264,052 for all specific damages to the Senecas.

I have also included an authorization for a Williamsburg-type development in the Hotchkiss Run area, based on historical portrayal of the Indian culture, heritage, and concept of life. The so-called Brill study, recommending such an imaginative and intriguing development for the area, has not provided sufficient data to justify full approval of this project by the Congress at this time. It is my hope that further and more complete information will be available soon. I have included in my bill the overall Brill figure of \$29 million for development costs so that the whole matter may be considered by the Indian Affairs Subcommittee as soon as possible.

We are now facing a very real danger that facilities for schools, roads, and housing will not be available to the Senecas when flooding begins. Congress must have the facts, before it authorizes expenditure of money. The facts have not been available and are only partially available now. Under these unusual circumstances, I am introducing my bill today without full data, in order that legislative delays can be minimized when all the facts are available to us.

THE ADAMS-MORGAN URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia has scheduled public hearings today and tomorrow, July 1 and 2, 1963, on an urban renewal plan for the Adams-Morgan area of the District of Columbia. The main question to be decided is whether the legal powers of urban renewal should be applied to this 40-block section covering 237 acres of some of the choicest real estate in the Nation.

What this means, basically, is that if the Commissioners of the District of Columbia approve this urban renewal plan all property within the project's boundaries will be subjected to the powers of eminent domain for a period of 20 years or more.

The urban renewal plan for the Adams-Morgan area was developed by the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, and the citizens of

the area had a limited opportunity to make known their views during the various stages of the plan's development. This plan calls for, first, the purchase and demolition by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency of about 22 percent of the total area; second, the clearance and rebuilding of a sizable part of the 18th and Columbia Road business section; the displacement of 141 businesses; the displacement of 1,585 families including some 5,700 persons, roughly one-third of the population; and the expenditure of \$13,137,000 for demolition alone.

The total net cost of the Government subsidy for clearance, "writedowns" in resale of property to developers, provision of public improvements and other work is estimated at \$21 million. Of this amount, the Federal Government would pay two-thirds, and the District government one-third.

The questions which the Congress must address itself to in connection with this Adams-Morgan plan are threefold: First, since the original intent of the Congress in establishing the urban renewal program was to clear our cities of slums we should try and determine if the Adams-Morgan area is a slum area. Significantly, evidence shows it is not.

Second, under the urban renewal program cities are required to pay a third of the cost. However, an article in the June 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest charges that while the law requires cities to pay a third of the cost they are being told "covertly, that the new school, the sewer, the park—which they were going to build or had built anyhow, and which have no connection with slum clearance—can be counted toward the city's contribution." The Congress will therefore, want to closely study a May 1959 report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States based on an audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 which is revealing.

Third, because of the special relationship which the Congress has with the District of Columbia, the Congress will want to thoroughly consider alternative plans to conserve and rehabilitate the Adams-Morgan area. Plans, furthermore, which might save the Federal Government all or most of the \$14 million which the present Adams-Morgan urban renewal plan would cost Federal taxpayers.

With regard to the question as to whether the Adams-Morgan area is a slum area or not, it is important to note that the District government in 1958 filed an application for a \$125,000 "demonstration grant" from the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The District's application stated that:

Our application is for a demonstration project to deal with techniques of developing, managing, and sustaining joint governmental and citizen action in the elimination and control of blight in an urban neighborhood which shows signs of deterioration but which is not yet so blighted as to warrant redevelopment procedures. Essentially, this is a proposal to help the residents help themselves, not only for the duration of the project, but for years to come.

The \$125,000 demonstration grant was made within a few months, and the terms of its contract stated that it was to be used to "develop and demonstrate methods and techniques of planning, organizing, managing, and sustaining joint governmental and citizen action in the elimination, control, and prevention of blight in an urban neighborhood showing signs of deterioration but not yet so blighted as to warrant redevelopment procedures."

What has happened in the short period since to warrant a demolition project costing \$13,137,000 involving 22 percent of the total Adams-Morgan area, the displacement of 141 businesses, and one-third of the population?

An interesting and informed statement on the Adams-Morgan Urban Renewal Project has been prepared by the leaders of the Lanier Place Protective Association for submission to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. I include it here for the information of my colleagues who are called upon to approximate tax money to the Housing and Home Finance Agency and who have a right to expect that it will be spent wisely and judiciously and not thrown away. I also include the opening remarks of our able colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Downy] at the District of Columbia Subcommittee's hearings on urban renewal in Washington.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN DOWDY OF TEXAS AT THE OPENING OF HEARINGS BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUBCOMMITTEE, ON MARCH 18, 1963, ON THE SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT

I believe that I speak for each member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia in stating that it is our desire that any urban renewal program in the District of Columbia should command the respect and approval of the residents of the District and metropolitan area.

The redevelopment program should also command the attention and admiration of the people in all of the States who contribute to local government costs through the Federal contribution to the District and through the Federal grants for urban renewal.

The District of Columbia is an area of about 40,000 acres. Only a little more than 13,000 acres of this area are available for private housing and business uses. Urban renewal, highway construction, and mass transportation programs underway or pending may call for expenditures of in excess of \$3 billion in the next 15 years.

Coordination of these programs and their efficient execution is essential.

The urban renewal program in the District has been underway for 12 years. The Southwest projects, which were the first undertaken, are only about 50 percent completed. Expenditures of public funds in the Southwest now approach \$100 million.

The Engineering Commissioner for the District has warned that the District is facing a shortage of noncash grants-in-aid and that cash funds will have to be sought soon for continuing the urban renewal program.

During the 86th Congress, the House District Committee held hearings on legislation amending the Redevelopment Act introduced by the late Hon. Louis Rabaut, of Michigan. Congressman Rabaut, as chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations, knew intimately of the problems in the urban renewal program. The Engineering Commissioner's

warning states that which Congressman Rabaut recognized nearly 5 years ago.

The Rabaut bill was designed to improve urban renewal operations, to prevent unnecessary expenditure of public funds, and to expedite completion of redevelopment work. The House of Representatives approved the Rabaut bill by a 10-to-1 rollcall vote. The bill was tabled by the other body.

STATEMENT OF THE LANIER PLACE PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION AT THE HEARING HELD BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ON THE ADAMS-MORGAN URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT, JULY 1 AND 2, 1963

The members of the Lanier Place Protective Association would like to address you not as experts on urban renewal, which we are not, but as residents and taxpayers of the District of Columbia who are particularly interested in upgrading the Adams-Morgan area.

We are, of course, deeply interested in this area which has long been our home, and where we hope to continue to live. For this reason, we have more than a passing interest in what urban renewal will do to us, and to others living in this area.

The Adams-Morgan area has several well-defined and historic neighborhoods within it, none of which could possibly be described as slums.

Lanier Place is located in what was originally known as the Lanier Heights area. Many famous people have lived on the street including Al Jolson, who lived at 1787 Lanier Place, which home still stands. Lanier Place is a part of area C of the Adams-Morgan project. This area C includes Crescent Place with its million-dollar hotels, apartment houses, and townhouses, including the home of Mrs. Eugene Meyer. It also includes the site once occupied by the home known as Henderson Castle. Sixteenth Street, familiarly known as "Embassy Row," is also in area C; as is the great Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints; the former home of Marshall Field; the Ontario Theater; and the Italian Embassy and chancery. Also located in this area are scores of the city's leading small businessmen.

The Kalorama Triangle, located between Columbia Road and Connecticut Avenue, is one of the finest close-in residential neighborhoods in Washington. Like Lanier Heights, it has long been an important part of Washington and many famous people have lived in it, including President Eisenhower. Early this year it was the subject of a major magazine article in the Sunday Star. None of the pictures of its fine houses which were published by the Star has ever appeared in the publications of the National Capital Planning Commission, or the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, possibly because if they were published therein they might possibly destroy the carefully nurtured myth that the Kalorama Triangle is a slum area badly in need of Federal urban renewal aid.

Area B is bounded by Columbia Road on the west, one of the finest streets in Washington. The Wyoming Apartments, the Argonne Apartments, the new Riggs bank, the new Giant and Safeway stores, the new Avignon Freres are located on Columbia Road. Area B also includes Mr. Cafritz' huge Universal Buildings. The immense luxury hotel of the Hilton hotel chain is being built in area B—the Washington Hilton.

It has been said with some justification that these fine residential areas listed above have been included in the Adams-Morgan project for the simple reason that certain businessmen who are the project's major backers realized that to get their business area at 18th Street and Columbia Road redeveloped they would need to include enough residential areas to make Adams-Morgan look like a better place to live project rather than what it really is: a clever

scheme to get their own business properties redeveloped at public expense.

Recently the New York Times reported that the Federal Housing Agency (FHFA) had granted funds for rehabilitation of some of New York City's large old homes—homes which are similar to some of those in the Adams-Morgan area—and their conversion into middle- and lower-income multiple-family houses. This is being done, it was said, on an experimental basis, and the argument was advanced that this conversion could be done and homes provided at a cost of around 35 percent less than in new housing built from the ground up. Why couldn't this be done in parts of Adams-Morgan, rather than turning to expensive demolition which will necessarily destroy the character of this fine intown area?

We are not against urban renewal, per se. Mr. Carl L. Shipley, District Republican Committee chairman, voiced the thoughts of many of us when he said on June 25, according to a report in the Washington Daily News that "the Adams-Morgan project will unjustifiably displace businesses," and that "we cannot afford to lose \$1 of business taxes, one job, or one business." Mr. Shipley declared that the Adams-Morgan area is one of the most convenient in the District and should be preserved at all costs. We agree wholeheartedly. What can, in fact, be said to justify a plan which will displace 141 businesses, and cause a loss of 1,500 jobs, businesses which do a total gross of tens of millions of dollars annually, have payrolls of several millions of dollars, and pay hundreds of thousands of dollars in taxes to the District government?

The Adams-Morgan urban renewal project has not been studied by the D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency with a view to ascertaining the cost to the District of this displacement. Why not? These businesses will go to the suburbs, and suburbanites do not pay for the upkeep of the city's vital services even though they benefit from them every time they come to the District. These costs are saddled on District residents, and add greatly to the cost of city living.

Forty percent of the small businessmen who have been displaced in the District of Columbia by Government action, including urban renewal, have failed in their new locations. This rate of failure is 60 percent higher than the national average, according to a telegram sent to President Kennedy by Mr. Joseph J. Honick, executive director of the Adams-Morgan Light Commercial Institute.

The Washington Post on Sunday, June 30, reported that the Adams-Morgan area has more than 17,000 people including 7,400 Negroes, and that one of the principal disappointments of the official plan is that it will displace an estimated 1,585 families, including some 5,700 persons—about one-third of the Adams-Morgan population. The same article says that housing beyond repair in the area (a category that includes 993 of the 6,712 dwelling units) will be demolished. One thousand five hundred new apartment units will be built to replace the housing which is demolished, with the middle-income tenant in mind.

The members of the Lanier Place Protective Association are deeply disturbed by the figure of \$13,137,000 for the demolition phase of the Adams-Morgan project, a figure which, the Washington Star reported on June 15, was given by Mr. Phil A. Doyle, executive director of the Redevelopment Land Agency, to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, headed by Congressman JOHN DOWDY.

This \$13 million plus demolition figure disturbs us because this entire program began as a conservation and rehabilitation movement and demolition and redevelopment wasn't even contemplated.

The Sunday Star set forth the history of the matter in a roundup article on June 30. Active concern for parts of the area goes back to the mid-1950's, and the formation of the Adams-Morgan Better Neighborhood Conference, in which members of the Lanier Place Protective Association were active. In response to this movement the District government in 1958 filed an application for a \$125,000 "demonstration grant," from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which stated:

"Our application is for a demonstration project to deal with techniques of developing, managing, and sustaining joint governmental and citizen action in the elimination and control of blight in an urban neighborhood which shows signs of deterioration but which is not yet so blighted as to warrant redevelopment procedures. Essentially, this is a proposal to help the residents help themselves, not only for the duration of the project, but for years to come."

The \$125,000 demonstration grant was made by the Federal Government. The terms of the contract stated that it was to be used to develop and demonstrate methods and techniques of planning, organizing, and sustaining joint governmental and citizen action in the elimination, control, and prevention of blight in an urban neighborhood showing signs of deterioration but not yet so blighted as to warrant redevelopment procedures.

What has happened in the short period since to warrant a demolition project of the magnitude of \$13 million?

Adams-Morgan has not and could not possibly deteriorate and decay that fast. A \$13 million demolition program has no possible relation with or to the original stated purposes of the Adams-Morgan project and it is our hope that the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, will not buy this "goldbrick" or accept it even as a gift.

The Lanier Place Protective Association members would like to call the attention of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the fact that some of the leaders in the Adams-Morgan Urban Renewal project have recently bought properties on Lanier Place and that they have not kept those properties up. In fact, they have let them run down, and they have plowed up the back gardens of the fine homes they acquired and converted them to illegal hard-top commercial parking lots. We have had a constant running battle with these people before the boards and agencies of the District government in an effort to preserve the residential character of Lanier Place. We shudder to think what would happen if these same people were to get in control of redevelopment in Adams-Morgan through such self-serving procedures as the A-M Corp. On the basis of our experience with these gentlemen, in our opinion there isn't a home or a business in the Adams-Morgan area which would be safe from demolition.

We are convinced that the present plan should be put on the shelf at this time, and that the Board of Commissioners of the District should insist on the adoption of the concepts embodied in the \$125,000 demonstration grant—in other words, joint governmental and citizen action in the elimination, control, and prevention of blight in an urban neighborhood showing signs of deterioration but not yet so blighted as to warrant redevelopment procedures.

For some time now those of us in the Adams-Morgan area who are firm in our conviction that this would be the better course, have been subjected to a sustained and bitter campaign of vilification. Our leaders have been threatened, efforts have been made to get them fired from their jobs, the newspapers use such terms as "violent opponents of the official plan" in describing us, and print stories about efforts to hang us in effigy. Meanwhile we are being constantly

reminded that, after all, we are paying taxes and if we don't get this easy Federal money some other far less deserving city will.

In this connection, we would like to call to your attention an article in the June 1963, issue of Reader's Digest on the self-help, non-Federal urban renewal program in Indianapolis, Ind. There, Democratic Mayor Albert H. Losche believes that the citizens of California, Kansas, or New York have no obligation to help clean up the slums and blighted areas of Indianapolis. He says "It's our job, and we intend to take care of it." This is what the Adams-Morgan Better Neighborhood Conference had in mind. In view of the soaring \$300 billion national debt, and the city's need for schools, as well as for a meaningful welfare program, we don't believe that the case for a \$13 million demolition program has been proved.

Indianapolis is fortunate in having a strong, aggressive chamber of commerce managed by a forthright individualist, Mr. William H. Book who reminds us what the aims of the Congress were in setting up the urban renewal program in the first place. He says:

"Originally, urban redevelopment was to clear our cities of slums. Today it's being expanded to save our downtowns—everybody's downtown. Not only are Federal officials dishing out this money; they are diligently searching for willing recipients. * * * Cities are required to pay a third of the cost, but they are told, covertly, that the new school, the sewer, the park—which they were going to build or had built anyhow, and which have no connection with slum clearance—can be counted toward the city's contribution."

Something like this seems to have been going on here in the District of Columbia, according to the May 1959 report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States based on an audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958.

The Sunday Star of June 30 brought this situation right up to date by reporting in its roundup article on Adams-Morgan that "in a report to the Commissioners last Friday, RLA said the District's share would not be needed in cash but could be financed partly by District work done in the area and partly from carryover credits for city work done in other urban renewal areas."

We understand that the General Accounting Office will shortly release a series of nine major studies of these and similar practices in other cities. In addition, lawyers from the General Accounting Office have worked with two leading Members of Congress in developing new bills to put an end to this practice in Washington and elsewhere.

We submit for study by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia a copy of the report by the Comptroller General of the United States on his audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to which we have referred.

In addition, we also submit the following bills: H.R. 7144 and H.R. 7145 by Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL; and H.R. 7318 and H.R. 7319 by Congressman JOHN KYL.

This report by the Comptroller General and these bills by Congressmen WIDNALL and KYL will be of particular interest to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as they consider whether the District can afford to pay for the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project in the light of much more pressing needs such as schools and welfare.

We have the assurances by Mr. Phil A. Doyle of the Redevelopment Land Agency that the District of Columbia can afford to pay for the Adams-Morgan project, and we have the publicly expressed doubts of Brig. Gen. Frederick J. Clarke, Engineer Commissioner, as to whether the District can really

afford to pay for it. At the same time, we have the report by the Comptroller General on how the District has paid for urban renewal in southwest Washington; and we have the quiet determination of leading Members of Congress to put an end to some of the noisome and patently shady practice of the Redevelopment Land Agency and the District regarding urban renewal. The far-ranging hearings of the House District Committee are further evidence of the congressional interest in urban renewal programs which have no possible connection with slum clearance.

Only a few months ago there was a long and skillfully directed campaign carried on by the National Capital Planning Commission to show that Georgetown needed an urban renewal program in the worst way. Fortunately, for Georgetown, and for the District of Columbia, the Commissioners decided that other things such as schools and welfare had higher priorities.

Surely, if the Commissioners took the trouble to walk through area A, along Columbia Road, 16th Street, Crescent Place, Lanier Place and saw the fine housing, if they visited the business places in the Adams-Morgan area including the new Riggs Bank and the recently completely and expensively remodeled Avignone Freres at 18th Street and Columbia Road, they would see for themselves how far this is from a slum area. They could only conclude that the step they took in Georgetown with regard to the waterfront in turning down the urban renewal program there is the only step they could take with regard to the Adams-Morgan project.

Furthermore, the case for turning down the Adams-Morgan project is stronger, because the history of this project shows that the 1958 application by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia was for a \$125,000 demonstration grant to develop "joint governmental and citizen action in the elimination and control of blight in an urban neighborhood which shows signs of deterioration but which is not yet so blighted as to warrant redevelopment procedures."

If we do not need a \$21 million urban renewal program of which \$13 million would be spent for demolition, leaving only \$8 million for buildings, then we must ask ourselves what the "joint governmental and citizen action in the elimination and control of blight" in the Adams-Morgan area might consist of.

The Reader's Digest article on Indianapolis' urban renewal program points to some possible answers, and it warns us about what is wrong with the Federal urban renewal program in these words: "It destroys the responsibility and incentive of local officials, who should have to account for what they spend and justify its need in the taxes they levy. It baits out the businessman whose downtown investment has gone sour. It gives the smart operator access to the Federal Treasury, so that he becomes the owner of a great new apartment center with little or no risk of his own money. With such vast sums of money involved, this is ideal hunting ground for the 'fast buck' operator."

The first thing that is needed is enforcement of the District's Housing Code. The Washington Post has been digging into this, and its articles should be must reading for the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

We submit herewith an article from the Washington Post of June 30, entitled "Enforcement of District Housing Code Is Lagging." This article states that lenience toward flouters of the city's minimum standards for health and safety in housing has meant that:

"Hundreds of families live in dilapidated dwellings waiting in vain for the repairs that

inspectors have ordered their landlords to make. Countless violations are never discovered because the city's 84 housing inspectors spend hundreds of fruitless hours trying to persuade reluctant persons to correct violations. Blight continues to spread through the city although the Housing Division has a budget of more than \$700,000 a year. At least 70 people, most of them defenseless infants, are bitten by rats every year. Untold rat bites never come to public attention.

Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER held hearings last week on three bills, H.R. 59 and House Joint Resolution 461 by Congressman KYL, and H.R. 679 by Congressman MULTER himself, to provide, as a number of other cities do, tax incentives for the repair, improvement, renovation, and restoration of residential and commercial property under the tax laws of the District of Columbia. A spokesman for the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners said the District couldn't afford such tax incentives.

So we have a situation in the District of Columbia where the slum landlord is favored by (1) Failure to enforce the District Housing Code; (2) low taxes on deteriorating and decaying buildings both residential and commercial, and high taxes on residential and commercial buildings which are repainted, remodeled, or improved in any way.

So the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, have managed to combine the maximum amount of discouragement to private rehabilitation and restoration with the minimum amount of discouragement to land speculation, a situation which leaves massive demolition and huge and expensive federally assisted urban renewal programs as the only possible solution which they will actively support and work for.

The District Commissioners and the Adams-Morgan Better Neighborhood Conference had a much better solution to blight in the \$125,000 "demonstration grant."

Some 55 U.S. cities are engaged in self-help programs, according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and these programs range from the type of program carried on by Indianapolis, to tax incentives in New York City, which, the District Commissioners say, we cannot afford. Some cities have taken a hard look at the huge profits which slum properties bring in, and have upped taxes on them enough to make them unprofitable.

The District Commissioners might well look at the taxing system in Arlington County, which has helped to end the blight there. Mr. Francis M. Austin, director of real estate assessments, explained the Arlington County tax program this way in a letter which was included in the hearings held by Congressman MULTER and we quote it because, if applied in the District of Columbia, it would make a very real and a very great difference in the Adams-Morgan area.

Mr. Austin said that:

"In the department of real estate assessments, our first attempt is to value land at its highest and best use in conformity with the zoning, regardless of what improvements may be on the property. If land is valued under this concept, it forces the owners to maintain an improvement in such a condition that it will provide a reasonable return on both land and buildings. In the event this does not happen the owner most generally will modernize, remodel, rebuild, or sell to someone who will develop the land properly.

"This approach to assessments tends to prevent wornout, rundown areas by the use of private capital which otherwise might turn out to be a Government expense under an urban renewal project."

Another thing which directly concerns the Lanier Place Protective Association membership is the fact that the District of Columbia government has done little or nothing to make the lot of private builders easy. Take the case of Mr. J. B. Shapiro, who wants to build a \$20 million apartment house of 1,500

units at 2700 Adams Mill Road. This apartment house alone would cost more than twice as much as the entire Adams-Morgan urban renewal project will have available for apartment and other building after it spends \$13 million of its proposed \$21 million for demolition. The Shapiro project will not cost the Federal or District Governments one red cent in taxpayers' moneys; it will, instead, pay as much as an estimated \$500,000 in taxes alone to the District government. The project would provide reasonably priced middle income housing, and it would greatly benefit the entire Adams-Morgan area in the same way that the new Hilton Hotel, and the Cafritz Universal buildings are and will benefit it.

The Adams-Morgan plan shows a high density area at the bus turn-around site just east of Calvert Street Bridge, a site immediately adjacent to the Shapiro tract. The Shapiro tract has been vacant for years, and has been a hideout for vagrants and various types of debauchees. Yet for the Shapiro tract it is impossible to obtain a high density zoning. The Washington Daily News reported recently that at least one of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts walked out of the hearing room in a "high dudgeon" during a hearing on the application by Mr. J. B. Shapiro.

The District government seems to be engaged in giving Mr. Shapiro a brushoff which would discourage any but the most resolute private builder.

The Washington Daily News reported on April 30 that:

"District Zoning Director Robert O. Clouser said J. B. Shapiro, whose office is at 1413 K Street NW., filed notice of his intent to build a \$20 million structure just before the new zoning plan took effect on May 12, 1958."

"* * * Mr. Clouser said the new zoning regulations also required that the builder go ahead with the plans he had submitted under the old regulations 'without substantial change or deviation.' In September 1959, the Board of Zoning Adjustment turned down Mr. Shapiro's request to relocate the building on his lot because it considered it a 'very substantial change.'

"Later, he said, Mr. Shapiro asked the Zoning Commission unsuccessfully for complete rezoning of the area to permit high-density instead of medium-density apartments."

"In the meantime, Licenses and Inspections Director J. J. Ilgenfritz said, no construction work has been done. The excavation, he said, simply involved the leveling of a hill—which was the site of an old cemetery that had to be moved."

"Inspectors decided the work wasn't moving with 'reasonable diligence,' Mr. Ilgenfritz said, and in January 1962, the building permits were canceled."

We would like to protest these harassments which have been heaped on Mr. Shapiro by the District government.

We would like to point out to the District Board of Commissioners that Mr. Ilgenfritz, who canceled Mr. Shapiro's building permits because his inspectors decided the work wasn't moving with "reasonable diligence," is the same Mr. Ilgenfritz who has utterly failed to enforce the Housing Code of the District. The Washington Post has mentioned him prominently in several recent articles. In a first page article in the City Life Section of the Washington Post of June 30 calling attention to the lagging enforcement of the District Housing Code, we read: "Joseph J. Ilgenfritz, Director of the Department of Licenses and Inspections, has stated that 'compliance and not prosecution' is his aim. Assistant Corporation Counsel Clark F. King, who is in charge of prosecutions at General Sessions Court, agrees."

"In effect, their policy has meant that a landlord who knows the wheels and pulleys of official machinery can delay legally required repairs for years with impunity."

Why is such favoritism shown slum landlords by the District government, while builders who want to put up apartment buildings are harassed and their building permits canceled?

Let us point out that many new apartment buildings are now being built with express train speed south of Washington in Virginia, and north of Washington in Maryland while, at the same time, private building of apartments and other housing in the District of Columbia is lagging far behind.

Are the city fathers interested only in aiding and assisting construction built under the auspices of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency? The Board of Commissioners should call the leading private builders of the District of Columbia together and find out what makes Virginia and Maryland so attractive to builders and the District so comparatively unattractive.

In conclusion, we would say that tax incentives, code enforcement, wise zoning procedures, and some of the plain commonsense which seems to be in such short supply in the District of Columbia and is abundant in evidence in Maryland and Virginia, would renew the Adams-Morgan area at no cost to the taxpayer and a lot more quickly and surely than the Federal urban renewal program, with its sorry and disgraceful record in Southwest Washington during the past 12 years.

One hundred million dollars in Federal and District tax funds have utterly failed to make the 500-acre Southwest urban renewal area attractive and livable. Georgetown and the Adams-Morgan area, right now, are much more attractive, and this without the doubtful ministrations of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

Furthermore, why should anyone support a program which will displace 141 businessmen and one-third of the Adams-Morgan population at a cost of \$21 million?

In a letter filed in connection with the hearings on the several bills to provide tax incentives in the District for rehabilitation and renovation of housing, Mr. Charles H. Purcell, president of the Washington Board of Realtors, declared:

"I can tell you that our taxing philosophy today is all wrong and that changes that would encourage rather than discourage owners keeping their property in a proper state of repair are long overdue."

The Adams-Morgan urban renewal plan is far and away the most expensive and destructive plan which could possibly have been put together, and it should be tried only after all other measures have failed.

It will vastly enrich a few businessmen in the Adams-Morgan area, at the expense, and indeed, the ruin of 141 others who will be displaced. All businessmen are not being given equal treatment, for some will remain and the ones who will remain will benefit enormously. They are the lucky ones, who got in on the ground floor early, and who have controlled the planning of the program.

The lure of easy money has always attracted certain kinds of men and women, even when such ill-gotten gains are obtained through the suffering of others. In human terms the price of easy money can be high, very high.

YANKEE INGENUITY

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I read a remarkable story about the exercise of American ingenuity in the manufacturing of television sets.

The story, in the Washington Evening Star, deals with the achievements of the General Electric Co. in producing a television set selling for less than \$100. This achievement will provide strong competition to foreign manufacturers.

Because the General Electric Co. is making this set in my congressional district, in Syracuse, I am pleased to place in the RECORD the excellent story from the Star.

It follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 11, 1963]

GE USING YANKEE INGENUITY TO BATTLE JAPAN'S INVASION OF ELECTRONICS FIELD—SMALL TV PRICE BROUGHT DOWN TO LESS THAN \$100

(By Charles Covell)

American manufacturers may have found a weapon with which to fight the mounting Japanese invasion of U.S. markets.

The weapon is an old one. It is popularly called Yankee ingenuity and the latest to utilize it is General Electric Co.

GE recently announced the introduction of a portable television set with an 11-inch picture tube that is lightweight enough for a child to carry. It is scheduled to hit the retail markets soon.

Biggest news, though, is in the price, \$99.95, list. Until now, GE representatives say, even the Japanese couldn't produce a set that would sell for under \$100. Only after GE announced the new portable did the Japanese make hurried plans to reduce the price of an 8-inch model to meet the competition.

INTERESTING BACKGROUND

Behind the new set, too, is an interesting story. It goes back to the early postwar years when Japan had only one real asset, cheap labor, while the United States had the plants and machine tools. In those days this country could offset the great difference in labor costs through its high degree of mechanization.

Then, like the Germans and others whose plants were bombed out, the Japanese began to rebuild. While U.S. machinery was wearing out, they came up with new plants and equipment that in some cases were equal to or better than ours.

Soon the Japanese were flooding the markets with their products at prices far lower than consumers were paying for U.S. goods or even European imports. This has been particularly true in items that take up small shipping space.

Japanese penetration of foreign markets has been especially noticeable in optical goods. Their cameras and binoculars have been giving the Germans keen competition. In sewing machines, Japan in a recent month produced more than any nation had in any 1 month in history.

COMPETITION IS MET

To meet this and other competition, some American companies with old, established names have been having their products made in that country.

But in no other field has Japan's economic growth been more apparent than in the electronics industry. In 1955, Japan's electronics production totaled only \$136 million, figures compiled here by the marketing service department of the Electronic Industries Association show. In that year, U.S. production totaled \$6.107 billion, or 61 times that of Japan.

Then Japanese output of pocket radios, television sets, other electronics products and components began to soar. By 1959 Japan

was approaching the billion mark, producing \$902.7 million while the U.S. production was \$9.75 billion. At the end of last year the margin was even narrower, Japanese production reaching \$1.6 billion and the United States, \$13.82 billion, a ratio of only 8 to 1.

The competition has been even more pronounced in television. In 1956, Japan produced 312,000 units while the U.S. output was 7.38 million. This was a ratio of 26 to 1. By 1961, the Japanese were producing 4.585 million units while the U.S. production was 6.178 million, a ratio of only 1½ to 1. In 1962 the margin was closer with 5,200 million units made in Japan and 6,471 million in the United States.

FLOOD CONTINUES

Trade sources say that the wave of consumer electronics shipped here from Japan shows no signs of decreasing. In the first quarter of 1963, the two key products, televisions, and radios with three or more transistors, showed substantial gains over the first quarter of 1962.

Operating under standards set by the Ministry of Foreign Trade, Japanese manufacturers are said to have cornered 55 percent of the U.S. market in portable radios and 10 percent of the market for small, portable television sets.

To meet the wage differential, 36 cents an hour in Japan compared with \$2.41 an hour, including all fringe benefits, for U.S. workers, some manufacturers of well-known television sets are having them made in Japan.

Magnavox, with its new 16-inch set, Olympic and, to a lesser degree, Symphonic, are all said to be buying sets in that country. Furthermore, all U.S. manufacturers are reported to be using or about to use Japanese components.

The Government seems inclined to do little about the competition because the balance of U.S. exports to Japan have far outweighed imports except in 1 year, 1959.

This is where Yankee ingenuity enters the picture. Since it couldn't lick the wage disparity, General Electric has been trying to meet the competition through new approaches.

SAVINGS MOUNT

Considerable savings have been made through "value analysis" studies. In these the company literally picks the brains of everyone remotely connected with the production of a television set and its components. For example, improving the design of a power transformer cut its cost from 37 to 17½ cents. Altering a metallic tube retainer lowered its price from 4.2 cents to less than a cent.

But GE thinks it has hit the jackpot with its new portable TV. In this it entirely eliminated the conventional chassis, mounting the components on the printed circuitry around, above and below the picture tube.

Not only does it cut costs by virtually ending all hand soldering operations, but GE engineers say it permits more accurate pre-testing of the chassis, reduces weight by eliminating nearly all metal parts and increases serviceability.

GOVERNMENT PROGRAM OF PURCHASING MICA FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Government program of purchasing mica for the national defense stockpile was terminated in July 1962. My colleague, the distinguished Congressman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], and myself introduced legislation earlier this year to set up a Government mica purchasing and auction program. We did this to relieve the critical economic situation existing in the mica industry.

In connection with this legislation, the Department of the Interior has rendered an adverse report, the General Services Administration has also rendered an adverse report. Their reasons for opposition, advanced in these reports, are that there is no longer a need to purchase mica for defense or other purposes. They also indicated that our existing inventories of mica are in excess of current requirements.

In their adverse reports on my legislation, the General Services Administration expressed concern that additional purchases could not be sold and would simply add to existing excesses. The Department of the Interior pointed out that my bill would put the Government in the position of a mineral broker and in competition with private enterprise.

With this background, Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to find that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has just announced its intention to furnish Brazil with 200,000 tons of wheat in exchange for ores including, specifically, mica.

Mr. Speaker, here we have a devastating situation indeed. The Department of the Interior and the General Services Administration have gone on record as saying that we do not need mica. At about the same time, the Department of Agriculture is engaged in a barter arrangement to obtain more mica. The transaction, as I understand it, insofar as it pertains to mica will result in approximately 240,000 pounds of mica coming into this country from Brazil. This is approximately equivalent to the total value of the mica produced in the United States in 1962.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of transaction that destroys one's confidence in the intelligence of the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, how can anyone explain to those people in the mica industry how our Government can permit this type of situation to take place. To the people involved, this is confusing and demoralizing. The U.S. Government has ended its national mica stockpiling program, but, at the same time, seeks to purchase additional mica from foreign sources. Mr. Speaker, I call on the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the General Services Administration, and all other agencies of Government with any decent concern for the preservation of American industry and jobs for our people to get together and investigate this situation.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I introduced, last week, additional legislation to help the mica industry. Under the provisions of this legislation—H.R. 7254—30 percent of all duties collected on the import of mica and mica products will be established in a special fund. The money will be used by the Secretary of the Interior to conduct technological

and related research projects to develop and increase markets for mica and mica products and to provide advertising and sales promotion programs.

Mr. Speaker, there is ample precedent for this legislation. I cite the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act which similarly provided a special fund for research and development in aid of the fisheries industry. Also, under the provisions of the national Wool Act of 1954, part of the tariffs on wool imports are set aside for development and sales promotion programs for wool. Those programs have been successful. The mica industry in this country is entitled in all fairness to similar help.

BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the following sincere and simple letter to me is from a small strawberry grower not in my district. Nevertheless, I feel some responsibility for his panic and the plight of those who depend upon him.

OXNARD BERRY FARM, INC.,
Oxnard, Calif.

DEAR SIR: I would like to tell you what the bracero program has meant to me. I have been a grower of strawberries since 1947. Then we shipped only to the local markets and a few as far as Portland and Seattle. Now we ship all over the United States and Canada. The reasons for the change is that we have learned to control the quality of the pick. To do this we have to have sufficient men to cover the field every 4 days. If we begin to get behind, we have to have a place where we can pick up sufficient men in a hurry to continue to control the pick. We need them now, not a week from now. The answer to this problem has been the bracero. Now that they are gone I cannot see how we are to solve this problem. There is no hope of mechanization in the foreseeable future, as we are handling the most perishable commodity on the market. It has to be selected gently every 4 days in order to be shipped.

I have to make a decision in the next 2 weeks on whether to plant or not. To plant an acre requires an investment of \$1,500. This is a lot of money to lay out when you cannot see any hope of labor to harvest your crop properly.

Will you be good enough to let me know whether you think there is any chance for some program for supplemental labor to be enacted this year.

Respectfully,

C. M. KENNEDY.

The strawberry plant is a perennial and produces over a 3- or 4-year period. The initial investment is great. The risks of favorable weather and market are even greater.

Mr. Kennedy is willing to assume these risks if he can obtain labor to harvest the crop. Without assurance of labor for the next 3 to 4 years he cannot plant.

Mr. Kennedy's risk and product will provide jobs for machinery and vehicle

manufacturers of many kinds; fertilizer manufacturers, distributors, and applicators; truckers; packers; shippers; allied processors, such as manufacturers and distributors of jams, jellies, ice cream, frozen desserts; paper, wooden, and metal packages; merchandisers, clerks, grocery store owners.

The farmers' share of the proceeds from strawberries is very small. Does anyone in Congress have an answer for Mr. Kennedy or the thousands of persons throughout the United States who depend upon him for their livelihood? I would like to hear.

J. F. K. FAILS TO INTERPRET HISTORY

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, many of us will agree that President Kennedy departed himself well on his tour of Europe. His homely visit to his fatherland struck the intimate pride of anyone with ancestors in Europe. The syntax and word selection of his speeches were brilliant.

However, another facet of the tour worries many of our citizens. For the considered, erudite view of the "loyal opposition," I commend the following editorial from the Monterey Peninsula Herald, by Allen Griffin, editor and publisher.

President John F. Kennedy's visit to Europe is an ill-fated tour that will bring no benefits to the United States and that possibly could bring ill fortune to Europe.

The President is visiting several countries that are under lame duck control. Adenauer of Germany, a great man whose place in history is already well carved, is in the last months of his career as Chief of State of that country. One of his greatest achievements was the rapport that he and President De Gaulle developed for the benefit of Europe's future.

In Italy, President Kennedy will deal with a government that may be no government at all. It is a bird of passage, here today and gone tomorrow. It is without any substantial influence in the affairs of other countries of Europe.

In England, President Kennedy has only to deal with the Macmillan government, unless it is thrown out in the meantime. It is a government that has been besmirched by the sex scandal of one of its leading ex-members. Nobody knows how many other scandals of similar poor odor are to be revealed.

There is only one government of a great power in Europe today that is sound, dependable, and free of scandal.

That is the Government of France under Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

In order to avoid any possible breath of contact with that government, the President of the United States had his flight adjusted so that he would not even fly over the free air of independent France. This is our misfortune, our miscalculation, and a repetition of the blunders made by Franklin Delano Roosevelt in regard to De Gaulle and, to a lesser extent, by President Truman in regard to De Gaulle.

Our capacity for no-see-'em ship is almost beyond belief. The President and his

advisers are supposed to be omnivorous readers. Perhaps they read without paying the least bit of attention to the subject matter of their reading. The subject matter is in the fascinating and instructive series of writings by Gen. Charles de Gaulle that are his war memoirs. There are three volumes, "The Call to Honor," "Unity," and "Salvation." If the leaders of this country had only been attentive enough to history to read these three volumes, they would not have made the mistakes that they are again making in spite of the instructions of history.

Another learned gentleman who receives far more praise than he deserves, except for his golf (which is very good), is Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas.

Not content with leaving the problem in its current seriousness, Senator FULBRIGHT endeavors to make it worse by declaring publicly that France is hostile to NATO because France is still "overcompensating" for her bad performance during World War II. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in a television program Sunday declared for all the world to hear that "the performance of France during World War II was not very creditable." France's pride has also been wounded, according to FULBRIGHT, by the country's "failure to operate a self-governing democracy" in the postwar years. Such wounded people, he says, must be handled "with kid gloves."

It appears that the United States, due to the kind of leadership it has in the White House and in the Senate, is intent upon doing endless damage to the relationships of the United States with the most powerful and, without doubt, the greatest country in Europe today, and the one under the most farsighted and determined leadership. This is fantastic. This is incredible.

If President Kennedy succeeds in any of his current efforts in Europe, his success will not strengthen NATO, it will not make friends for the United States, it will not lead to peace in this world.

The President of the United States seems to be determined to cause a rift between the two ancient enemies, France and Germany, who have, under the great leadership of Adenauer and De Gaulle, brought about a rapport that has promised a Europe at peace. For every person who looks forward to a period, a long period, of peace within Europe, this is a mistake beyond any calculation. It is sophomoric in its concept. It is vain and egotistical. It is utterly lacking in any conception of the role of history.

NEGLECTING TO ACKNOWLEDGE THOSE GOOD AND WORTHY THINGS

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, one of our persistent failings in our relations with each other is that of neglecting to acknowledge those good and worthy things done by our friends and associates.

Our wives tell us this when we let too long a period pass without a word of appreciation or complimentary expression and we dutifully make amends for this delinquency from time to time.

But such a failing is more common outside the family situation where we have grown accustomed to receiving unacknowledged the good works of good men. It is as though we took such works from them for granted, as though they were due and expected.

In a sense they are, for we expect a good man to do good things. However, this is not to say that an expression of appreciation, an acknowledgment, should not also be due and expected.

It is my desire to state in this fashion my personal regard and appreciation for one of my associates on the delegation from Texas, in this case the senior Senator from Texas.

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH is a man whom I have known for a number of years and my measure of him grows as time continues.

We have a saying in Texas that great things can be grown on all our land in all parts of our State. Strangers hear this and point to some arid, sandy area sprinkled with rocks, and we have some such, and they ask what can be grown there. Our answer is men. We can grow great men. We are proud of the great men who have grown on our soil, and we are proud of Senator YARBOROUGH.

He happens to come from a most verdant, forested area of our State. It is one of the first settled areas which was very much a part of the economy and the social order of the Deep South. It is the Deep South. We call it deep east Texas.

Our senior Senator comes from that area and I know full well his pride in all the good things of that heritage. I know too the trials he has had carrying that love for his past into this fast-changing time where as our world shrinks we search for ways to accommodate ourselves to each other.

I have watched Senator YARBOROUGH search for such accommodations and as he did so, he each time searched for that which was honorable, that which was worthy of one who wished to lead and not simply mirror that which was popular. This is in the tradition of greatness, and I compliment the Senator for it.

The reason these things are on my mind today is that I learn that a Washington paper recently editorially chided all southern Senators for not speaking out, for holding their peace, while the Nation is wracked in public debate on issues that are controversial and important, though not popular in their home States.

This was in error, for it fails to credit the senior Senator from Texas with having spoken out forthrightly in an effort to stay the excesses of bigotry and to promote a decent regard for human dignity. These things he has done.

Recently, following President Kennedy's speech to the Nation on June 11, 1963, Senator YARBOROUGH stood tall when asked for comment on that speech. His comments were:

President Kennedy made a reasoned appeal based on the American sense of justice, and on the principles announced long ago in the Declaration of Independence.

The President's statement is powerful because it appealed to reason and to justice and to fairness.

It is strong because it appealed to the spirit of man.

It did not rattle a domestic sword; it was not a threat, but a promise; it did not threaten to stamp people who did not agree with him.

Its strength lies in the quest for the conscience of Americans.

I believe the goal and the ultimate effect of the President's speech will be to help unify and strengthen the country.

I like a man who stands tall. I like it especially when he does it while others are hunkering down like a low bush in a heavy wind.

We have a tall standing Senator from Texas, and we are proud of him.

PRODUCTIVITY OF LABOR

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this House earlier this session wisely chose to reject a 2-year extension of the Bracero Act, Public Law 78. I should hope that we will continue to reject any extension of this act which by injecting a large supply of cheap labor into the American agricultural market prevents the wages of domestic migrant workers from rising through the market forces of supply and demand.

Proponents of Public Law 78 have not only claimed a great insufficiency of domestic labor for agricultural stoop labor, thereby justifying in their eyes the bracero program; they have also cited reasons why wages of the workers should be deplorably low.

Mr. Matt Triggs, assistant legislative director for the American Farm Bureau Federation, based his argument for low migrant worker wages on their low productivity when he testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor on April 24. He argued for allowing free economic forces to improve the lot of the migrant workers, and claimed that wages will not rise in such a free market until the productivity of the migrants increases.

First might I ask: Why does he artificially alter free market forces by introducing a cheap foreign labor force? And second, I might point out his distortion of the influence of productivity on wage rates. Does the constant and low productivity of such people as bricklayers, painters, cabinetmakers, custodians, and so forth keep their wages where they were years ago? Certainly not. The element of the supply of workers is often more important than productivity considerations.

To a small extent technology and productivity do place limits on the amount a farmer can pay. The price of the farmer's product, however, as well as productivity, determines wage ceilings. Our society could certainly afford to pay

the migrant a higher wage. That will not happen until the free market forces of supply and demand forces both wages and prices up. A bracero program does not allow these forces to operate freely and effectively.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WEAVER (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER), for 2 hours, on July 23, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD in two instances.

Mr. FOREMAN.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. SIKES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARSH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. POWELL in four instances.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 280. An act for the relief of Etsuko Matsuo McClellan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 296. An act for the relief of Anne Marie Kee Tham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 538. An act for the relief of Henry Bang Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 546. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for the use of lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, Calif., for a nuclear electric generating station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 568. An act for the relief of Denis Ryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 733. An act for the relief of Yung Yuen Yau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 753. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giuseppe Rafala Monarca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 879. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the building of Perry's fleet and the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1082. An act to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1125. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1201. An act for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1230. An act for the relief of Carlton M. Richardson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1401. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, construct, operate, and regulate a public offstreet parking facility; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1489. An act for the relief of J. Arthur Fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 27, 1963, deliver to the White House for forwarding to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1492. An act to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart;

H.R. 1819. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1937. An act to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940;

H.R. 3537. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6791. An act to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 467. Joint resolution amending section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years the broadened eligibility presently provided for mortgage insurance thereunder.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

986. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize increased fees for the sale of U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office publications"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

987. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review of separation, storage, and disposal of records at selected Federal records centers, National Archives, and Records Service, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

988. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report

on unnecessary expenditures of more than \$1 million for storage of petroleum in a commercial facility at Plattsburgh, N.Y.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

989. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overprocurement of transponders for the Nike-Hercules guided missile system by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

990. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the unnecessary payment by the United States of costs properly chargeable to Japan for administrative and related expenses of the military assistance program for Japan; to the Committee on Government Operations.

991. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

992. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

993. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting an economic report to the Federal Trade Commission by its staff entitled "Economic Inquiry Into Food Marketing—Part II: The Frozen Fruit, Juice, and Vegetable Industry"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

994. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering all tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1962, pursuant to (23 U.S.C., sec. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. Report pursuant to 63 Stat. 377; without amendment (Rept. No. 490). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 1341. A bill to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards; with amendment (Rept. No. 491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3306. A bill to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission; with amendment (Rept. No. 492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5883. A bill to correct a land description in the act entitled "An act to provide for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6496. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain federally owned land in trust status to the Cherokee Indian Tribe of Okla-

homa; with amendment (Rept. No. 494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6710. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 6998. A bill to provide for increased wheat acreage allotments in the Tulare area of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee of Conference. H.R. 5207. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 497). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 292. An act for the relief of Yoo Chul Soo; without amendment (Rept. No. 486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 310. An act for the relief of Kalno Hely Auzis; with amendment (Rept. No. 485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 686. An act for the relief of Millie Gail Mesa; without amendment (Rept. No. 486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 671. An act for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian; with amendment (Rept. No. 487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 735. An act for the relief of Peter Hope-ton Maylor; without amendment (Rept. No. 488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 866. An act for the relief of Enrico Petrucci; without amendment (Rept. No. 489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:
H.R. 7351. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to increase the authorization for appropriations under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINDLEY:
H.R. 7352. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the delivery of Lincoln's immortal address at Gettysburg; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOGARTY:
H.R. 7353. A bill to require certain standards of nonpersistence of synthetic pesticide chemicals (economic poisons) manufactured in the United States or imported into the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 7354. A bill to authorize the acquisition of and the payment for a flowage and clearing easement and rights-of-way over lands within the Allegany Indian Reservation in New York, required by the United States for the Allegheny River (Kinzua Dam) project, to provide for the relocation, rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7355. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H.R. 7356. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7357. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit the revocation of retired pay of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 7358. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7359. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fire Island National Seashore, in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 7360. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the "Buy American Act," as it relates to the acquisition of steel, steel products, and steel materials for public use; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7361. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the "Buy American Act," as it relates to the determination of the reasonability of cost of steel, steel products, and steel materials; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7362. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 7363. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to permit cooperative housing mortgages insured under section 213 to be refinanced under section 221(d)(3); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7364. A bill to amend section 221 of the National Housing Act to permit units for single persons to be included in projects of public and nonprofit mortgagors financed under subsection (d)(3) thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 7365. A bill to amend the act of September 30, 1961, with respect to the application of the antitrust laws to the televising of the games of certain professional teams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 7366. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEPSON:

H.R. 7367. A bill to prohibit trade with Communist nations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 7368. A bill to designate the reservoir on the Shenango River above Sharpsville, Pa., as the George Mahaney Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 7369. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer

to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of himself or his spouse or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 7370. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.J. Res. 530. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the right to read from the Holy Bible and to offer nonsectarian prayers in the public schools or other public places if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 531. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the right to read from the Holy Bible and to offer nonsectarian prayers in the public schools or other public places if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 532. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.J. Res. 533. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.J. Res. 534. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.J. Res. 535. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim a week in March of each year as National Health Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 536. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim a week in March of each year as National Health Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 537. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to authorize Congress, by two-thirds vote of both Houses, to override decisions of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.J. Res. 538. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution providing for the annual observance of the Liberty Bell anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. Res. 426. Resolution to prohibit backdoor spending; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the release of all unimproved U.S. lands in Wakulla County, Fla., for the use of the public for recreational purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the Presi-

dent and the Congress of the United States to recognize and commend volunteer firemen of the State for their unselfish and dedicated devotion to the happiness and well-being of the people of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to transmitting a certified copy of chapter 109, "Laws of 1963"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 7371. A bill for the relief of Vasillos Trilivas, Polyxeni Trilivas, and Savas Trilivas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 7372. A bill for the relief of Maja Thomsen Hoffmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

174. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Marian I. Carney, executive secretary, Northwest Line Constructors Chapter, National Electrical Contractors Association, Portland, Oreg., relative to reflecting our critical view of the restrictive regulations recently and jointly issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Department of the Interior relating to the crossing of public lands by non-Federal builders of powerlines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

175. Also, petition of J. A. Brunton, Jr., chief scout executive, National Council, Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N.J., relative to the leadership of President Kennedy, Cabinet members, Members of the Congress, and other leaders of our Nation; to the Committee on House Administration.

176. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Village Motor Lodge, Yellowstone Park, Wyo., requesting the initiation of a constitutional amendment proposal to permit local school boards to permit Bible reading and prayers in public schools within their jurisdiction, in spite of the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

177. Also, petition of Aime J. Forand, president, National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., Washington, D.C., relative to supporting the bills H.R. 5625 and S. 1321, which calls for an appropriation of \$5 million to set up a National Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

178. Also, petition of Aime J. Forand, president, National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., Washington, D.C., urging the Congress to reject the proposed legislation as described in S. 774 and H.R. 3669; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

179. Also, petition of Aime J. Forand, president, National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., Washington, D.C., requesting additional living quarters for the senior citizens of the United States, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

180. Also, petition of Aime J. Forand, president, National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., Washington, D.C., relative to endorsing the principle of health care insurance through social security such as embodied in the current legislation in Congress known as the King-Anderson Hospital Insurance Act of 1963, which would provide medical care to senior citizens over 65 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.